

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed January 24, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,454 to Riggins; rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212587 to Jamison (Jamison); and rejected claims 6, 8, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0002526 to Dias et al. (Dias).

By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 18, and 19 to more clearly define the features of those claims and cancels claims 5 and 17. Applicant submits that the amendments are supported by the specification (see, e.g., paragraphs 0014, 0017, and 0019-0022).

Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18-19 are currently pending.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4¹, 7, 9-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Riggins. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

On page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Riggins at col. 4, lines 10-14 as well as FIG. 7 discloses the following feature of claim 1: "assigning each web service with one or more of a plurality of types, the address including a uniform resource locator (URL) for each of the plurality of web services and the at least one parameter, the assignment stored at a table at the server." Rather than disclose the

¹ Claim 5 has been canceled.

noted feature of claim 1, Riggins at FIG. 7 merely *lists* "services" including an "e-mail service program, and address book service program, a calendar service program, a paging service program, [and] a company database service program" instead of any type of actual, active assignment of the service to a type. Riggins, col. 4, lines 10-14 and FIG. 7 at 700. Moreover, the Riggins list of services does not constitute assigning each web service with types, addresses (e.g., the URL of the web service), and parameters specific to the web service as well as storing the assignment at a table at the server. Accordingly, Riggins fails to disclose at least the following feature of claim 1: "assigning each web service with one or more of a plurality of types, the address including a uniform resource locator (URL) for each of the plurality of web services and the at least one parameter, the assignment stored at a table at the server."

Because Riggins fails to disclose "assigning" as recited in claim 1 and noted above, Riggins cannot possibly disclose "in response to a client running the application, sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application," as recited in claim 1. Emphasis added.

Moreover, Riggins is completely silent with respect to the following feature: "in response to the user selecting one of the one or more web services in the list, redirecting the client to the selected web service, by constructing, by the server, the URL for the selected web service from the address and the at least one parameter stored at the table at the server, wherein redirecting the client comprises generating a URL call with a format compliant with an Open Catalog Interface and an Open Partner Interface."

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is not anticipated by Riggins, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 and claims 3-4, 7, and 9, at least by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

Independent claims 10 and 19, although of different scope, include features similar to those of independent claim 1. Dependent claims 11-16 depend from independent claim 10. For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, claims 10 and 19 are not anticipated by Riggins. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claims 10 and 19 as well as claims 11-16, at least by reason of their dependency from claim 10, should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212587 to Jamison.

Claim 2 recites the following feature: "assigning, at the server, each of the web services with one of a plurality of business types, the address including the URL and the at least one parameter, the business types representing the type of information each web service provides, the assignment stored at a table at the server." The Examiner appears to acknowledge that Riggins fails to disclose the noted feature of claim 2. Final Office Action, page 10. To cure that deficiency, the Examiner relies on Jamison. But Jamison describes UDDI which does not classify the web service based on the type of information it provides. Instead, UDDI, like the traditional AT&T Yellow Pages, classifies based on "industry." Specifically, Jamison states:

[0050] UDDI is an industry initiative for a universal business registry or catalog of web services. UDDI is designed to enable software to automatically discover and integrate with services on the World Wide Web. UDDI contains white pages (addresses and contacts), yellow pages (industry classification) and green pages (description of services). The green pages include the XML version, type of encryption and a Document Type Definition (DTD) of the standard. UDDI messages ride on top of the SOAP protocol, which invokes services on the web.

Accordingly, neither Riggins nor Jamison, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the following feature of claim 2: "assigning, at the server, each of the web services with one of a plurality of business types, the address including the URL and the at least one parameter, the business types representing the type of information each web service provides, the assignment stored at a table at the server." Therefore, claim 2 is allowable over Riggins and Jamison, whether taken alone or in combination, and the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Moreover, claim 2 includes the following feature: "redirecting, in response to the user selecting one of the one or more web services in the list, the client to the selected web service by constructing, by the server, the URL for the selected web service from the address and the at least one parameter stored at the table at the server, wherein redirecting the client comprises generating a URL call with a format compliant with an Open Catalog Interface and an Open Partner Interface." However, neither Riggins nor Jamison disclose the claimed "redirecting" feature, much less redirecting "by constructing, by the server, the URL for the selected web service from the address and the at least one parameter stored at the table at the server, wherein redirecting the

client comprises generating a URL call with a format compliant with an Open Catalog Interface and an Open Partner Interface.” For this additional reason, claim 2 is allowable over Riggins and Jamison, whether taken alone or in combination, and the rejection of claims 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 8, and 18² under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of Dias. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 6 and 8 each depend from claim 1 and each recite all the features therein including “assigning each web service with one or more of a plurality of types, the address including the URL for each of the plurality of web services and the at least one parameter, the assignment stored at a table at the server” and “in response to the user selecting one of the one or more web services in the list, redirecting the client to the selected web service, by constructing, by the server, the URL for the selected web service from the address and the at least one parameter stored at the table at the server, wherein redirecting the client comprises generating a URL call with a format compliant with an Open Catalog Interface and an Open Partner Interface.” For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Riggins fails to disclose or suggest these features. Moreover, although Dias discloses “OCI,” Dias fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Riggins. Accordingly, neither Riggins nor Dias, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests these noted features. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

² Claim 17 has been canceled.

Claims 18 depend from claim 10 and each recite all the features therein including, among other things, "in response to the user selecting one of said external web services, redirecting the client browser to the selected external web service by constructing, by the integration module, the address including a uniform resource locator (URL) for the selected external web service, wherein redirecting the client comprises generating a URL call with a format compliant with an Open Catalog Interface and an Open Partner Interface." For the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Riggins fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Moreover, although Dias discloses "OCI," Dias fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Riggins. Accordingly, neither Riggins nor Dias discloses or suggests this noted feature. Therefore, the rejection of claims 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner. Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner continue to dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Applicant : Peter Schwarze
Serial No.: 10/712,759
Filed : November 12, 2003
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 34874-359/2003P00068US

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-359/2003P00068US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 April 2008

/PFS/

Pedro F. Suarez
Reg. No. 45,895

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
5355 Mira Sorrento Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Phone: (858) 320-3040
Fax: (858) 320-3001